

Application No. 10/763,098
Amendment "A" dated December 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed November 16, 2005

REMARKS

The Office Action, mailed November 16, 2005, considered and rejected claims 1-24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,738,526 (Belrisey). Claims 23 and 24 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

By this paper, claims 23 and 24 have been amended to clarify that these dependent claims are directed to computer program products, which depend from claim 22 (also a computer program product claim). In view of the foregoing amendments, the rejections to claims 23 and 24 are now overcome and should, therefore, be withdrawn.

Now, with regard to the obviousness-type double patenting rejections, Applicants submit that these rejections should also be withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer that has been filed with this paper for U.S. Patent No. 6,738,526.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 5 day of December, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RUN:JCJ:ppa
PPA0000001811V001